

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Ronald Ceo, #258464,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	C.A. No.: 4:06-2003-RBH
	)	
vs.	)	<b>O R D E R</b>
	)	
John Ozmint, Director of SCDC; and Henry	)	
McMaster, Attorney General for South	)	
Carolina,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Petitioner filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required

to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Rogers' Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

**ORDERED** that the petition is hereby dismissed without prejudice and without requiring the respondents to file an answer or return under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

S/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
September 29, 2006